arXiv:1511.07769v2 [math.GR] 5 Oct 2016

A family of irretractable square-free solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation

D. Bachiller F. Cedó E. Jespers J. Okniński

Abstract

A new family of non-degenerate involutive set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation is constructed. All these solutions are strong twisted unions of multipermutation solutions of multipermutation level at most two. A large subfamily consists of irretractable and square-free solutions. This subfamily includes a recent example of Vendramin [38, Example 3.9], who first gave a counterexample to Gateva-Ivanova's Strong Conjecture [19, Strong Conjecture 2.28(I)]. All the solutions in this subfamily are new counterexamples to Gateva-Ivanova's Strong Conjecture and also they answer a question of Cameron and Gateva-Ivanova [21, Open Questions 6.13 (II)(4)]. It is proved that the natural left brace structure on the permutation group of the solutions in this family has trivial socle. Properties of the permutation group and of the structure group associated to these solutions are also investigated. In particular, it is proved that the structure groups of finite solutions in this subfamily are not poly-(infinite cyclic) groups.

2010 MSC: 16T25, 20E22, 20F16.
Keywords: Yang-Baxter equation, set-theoretic solution, brace.

1 Introduction

Since its appearance in a paper of Yang [39], the Yang-Baxter equation has become an important equation in mathematical physics and also in quantum group theory. It has stimulated a lot of activity and led to a diversity of new methods in several related areas of algebra. Recall that a set-theoretic solution of the Yang-Baxter equation on a non-empty set X is a bijective map $r\colon X\times X \longrightarrow X\times X$ such that

$$r_{12}r_{23}r_{12} = r_{23}r_{12}r_{23},$$

where r_{ij} denotes the map $X \times X \times X \longrightarrow X \times X \times X$ acting as r on the (i, j) components and as the identity on the remaining component. Drinfeld, in [14] suggested that is of interest to study set-theoretic solutions of the quantum Yang-Baxter equation

$$R_{12}R_{13}R_{23} = R_{23}R_{13}R_{12}.$$

It is known that if $\tau\colon X\times X \longrightarrow X\times X$ is the twist map $\tau(x,y)=(y,x)$, then a map $r\colon X\times X \longrightarrow X\times X$ is a set-theoretic solution of the Yang-Baxter equation if and only if $R=\tau\circ r$ is a set-theoretic solution of the quantum Yang-Baxter equation.

In recent years, a special class of solutions of this type, the non-degenerate involutive solutions, has received a lot of attention [10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30]. Also, this class of solutions has connections with many topics in mathematics, such as semigroups of I-type and Bieberbach groups [23], bijective 1-cocycles [16], radical rings [30], triply factorized groups [36], Hopf algebras [15], regular subgroups of the holomorf and Hopf-Galois extensions [9, 18], groups of central type [6, 7].

To study involutive non-degenerate set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, Rump introduced in [30] a new algebraic structure, called a brace. Recall that a left brace is a set B with two binary operations, a sum $+$ and a product $\cdot$, such that $(B,+)$ is an abelian group (the additive group of B), $(B,\cdot)$ is a group (the multiplicative group of B) and

$$a\cdot(b+c)+a=a\cdot b+a\cdot c,$$

for all $a,b,c\in B$. Rump has begun to develop the theory of braces in a series of papers [29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35]. The usefulness of this algebraic structure to solve problems about this type of solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation is confirmed by the results proven in [11]. Even more, in [4], the classification of involutive non-degenerate set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation is reduced to the classification of left braces. Rump [31] and Bachiller [1] classified some special classes of left braces. These results indicate that the classification of arbitrary left braces (even in the finite case) seems to be a very difficult problem. If B is a finite left brace, then it is known that the multiplicative group of B is solvable [16]. Using some preliminary ideas of Rump, stated in [35], and developing new ideas on left braces, it has recently been proven in [2] that there exist finite p-groups which are not multiplicative groups of finite left braces. This answers in the negative a question which appears implicitly in [16] and explicitly in [12]. It is an open problem to characterize the finite solvable groups which are multiplicative groups of left braces.

A possible strategy to classify finite left braces is the following. First, construct and classify the finite simple left braces. Second, develop the theory of extensions of finite left braces.

Recall that an ideal of a left brace B is a normal subgroup I of the multiplicative group of B such that

$$ba-b\in I,$$

for all $b\in B$ and all $a\in I$. The socle of a left brace B is

$$\mathrm{Soc}(B)=\{a\in B \mid ab=a+b \text{ for all } b\in B\}.$$

It is an ideal of B (see [11, page 107]). One says that the left brace B is simple if $B\neq\{1\}$ and $\{1\}$ and B are the only ideals of B. Rump, in [30], has shown

that the only simple finite nilpotent left braces (that is, the multiplicative group of B is nilpotent) are the cyclic groups $\mathbb{Z}/(p)$, with p a prime, and it turns out that the multiplication of the brace is equal to the sum. Recently Bachiller [3] has developed a method to construct finite non-nilpotent simple left braces and has given some families of such braces. To apply this method of constructing new finite simple left braces it is important to discover new families of finite left braces with trivial socle. Note that, obviously, any finite non-nilpotent simple left brace should have trivial socle. Some families of finite left braces with trivial socle have been given in [9, 24]. The natural structure of a left brace on the permutation group of a finite irretractable solution yields a class of finite braces with trivial socle (see Lemma 2.1 below). Therefore, to find new families of finite irretractable solutions, or, more general, new families of finite left braces with trivial socle is of interest from the point of view of the classification of finite left braces.

Another key ingredient of the classification would be the theory of extensions of left braces. However, very little is known about this (see [3, 8]).

Vendramin in [38, Example 3.9] gives a counterexample to a conjecture of Gateva-Ivanova [19, Strong Conjecture 2.28(I)], see Section 3, by constructing an irretractable square-free involutive non-degenerate set-theoretic solution of the Yang-Baxter equation (X, r) with $|X| = 8$. It is remarkable that among the 2471 square-free non-degenerate involutive set-theoretic solutions on a set X with $|X| \leq 8$ this is the only counterexample to the Gateva-Ivanova conjecture (see Remark 3.11 in [38]). Furthermore, studying this example of Vendramin one can check that it is a strong twisted union of two multipermutation solutions of multipermutation level two. Thus this yields a negative answer to a question posed by Cameron and Gateva-Ivanova [21, Open Questions 6.13 (II)(4)], although Vendramin did not notice this fact in [38].

In this paper we construct a large family of irretractable square-free involutive non-degenerate solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation that includes the example of Vendramin. Thus these solutions are new counterexamples to [19, Strong Conjecture 2.28(I)]. These solutions are strong twisted unions of multipermutation solutions of multipermutation level 2, corresponding to their orbits under the action of its permutation group. Hence, these solutions also yield a negative answer to a question posed by Cameron and Gateva-Ivanova in [21, Open Questions 6.13 (II)(4)]. The natural structure of left brace on the permutation group of these solutions provides a new family of left braces with trivial socle. We also study another structure associated to a solution of the Yang-Baxter equation, the so called structure group (which is a solvable Bieberbach group if the solution is finite) introduced by Etingof, Schedler and Soloviev [16]. In particular, we prove that these groups are not poly-(infinite cyclic). This is in contrast with the case of multipermutation solutions, whose structure groups are always poly-(infinite cyclic).

2 Preliminary results

We begin by recalling the necessary terminology and notation. Let X be a non-empty set and $r\colon X \times X \longrightarrow X \times X$ a map, and write $r(x,y) = (\sigma_x(y), \gamma_y(x))$. Recall that (X,r) is said to be a non-degenerate involutive set-theoretic solution of the Yang-Baxter equation if and only if the following properties hold.

(1) $r^2 = \mathrm{id}_{X^2}$ (r is involutive).

(2) $\sigma_x, \gamma_x \in \mathrm{Sym}(X)$, for all $x \in X$ (r is non-degenerate).

(3) $r_{12}r_{23}r_{12} = r_{23}r_{12}r_{23}$.

It is easy to check that (1) and (2) imply $\gamma_y(x) = \sigma^{-1}_{\sigma_x(y)}(x)$, for all $x, y \in X$.

Convention. By a solution of the YBE we mean a non-degenerate involutive set-theoretic solution of the Yang-Baxter equation.

A solution (X,r) of the YBE is called square-free if $r(x,x) = (x,x)$ for all $x \in X$. If $r(x,y) = (y,x)$, i.e. if all $\sigma_x = \mathrm{id}_X$, then r is called the trivial solution.

The structure group of a solution (X,r) of the YBE is the group $G(X,r) = \langle X \mid xy = zt \text{ whenever } r(x,y) = (z,t)\rangle$. The permutation group of (X,r), denoted $\mathcal{G}(X,r)$, is the subgroup of the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ on X generated by $\{\sigma_x \mid x \in X\}$.

Etingof, Schedler and Soloviev in [16] proposed the following interesting operator for studying the structure group $G(X,r)$ and to classify solutions of the YBE. We recall its definition. Given a solution (X,r) of the YBE, with $r(x,y) = (\sigma_x(y), \gamma_y(x))$, define the equivalence relation $\sim$ on X by

$$x \sim y \text{ if and only if } \sigma_x = \sigma_y.$$

We denote by $\bar{x}$ the $\sim$-class of $x \in X$. The retraction $\mathrm{Ret}(X,r)$ of (X,r) is the solution $(\bar{X}, \bar{r})$, where $\bar{X} = X/\sim$ and $\bar{r}(\bar{x},\bar{y}) = (\overline{\sigma_x(y)}, \overline{\gamma_y(x)})$. A solution (X,r) of the YBE is said to be a multipermutation solution if there exists a positive integer n such that $\mathrm{Ret}^n(X,r)$ is a solution on a set of cardinality 1. The multipermutation level of a multipermutation solution (X,r) of the YBE is the smallest positive integer n such that $\mathrm{Ret}^n(X,r)$ is a solution on a set of cardinality 1. One says that (X,r) is irretractable if $\mathrm{Ret}(X,r) = (X,r)$.

Rump in [30] introduced a new algebraic structure, called a left brace. This allows another possible strategy to attack the problem of constructing and classifying the solutions of the YBE. Recall that a left brace is a set B with two operations, an addition $+$ and a multiplication $\cdot$, such that $(B,+)$ is an abelian group, $(B,\cdot)$ is a group and

$$a \cdot (b+c) + a = a \cdot b + a \cdot c,$$

for all $a, b, c \in B$. It follows that $a \cdot (b - c) = a \cdot b - a \cdot c + a$, for all $a, b, c \in B$. For $a \in B$, we denote by λ_a the map $B \longrightarrow B$ defined by $\lambda_a(b) = a \cdot b - a$, for all $b \in B$. In fact $\lambda_a \in \mathrm{Aut}(B, +)$, and $\lambda \colon (B, \cdot) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(B, +)$, defined by $\lambda(a) = \lambda_a$, is a group homomorphism (see [11]). The socle, $\mathrm{Soc}(B)$, of a left brace B is defined as

$$\mathrm{Soc}(B) = \{a \in B \mid \lambda_a = \mathrm{id}_B\}.$$

It is an ideal of B, i.e. a normal subgroup of $(B, \cdot)$ that is invariant under all maps λ_a. (For the definitions of a homomorphism of left braces, of a right brace and of related notions we refer to [11]). Note that the maps λ_a give a useful link between the two operations in a left brace B, that is

$$a \cdot b = a + \lambda_a(b) \quad \text{and} \quad a + b = a \cdot \lambda_a^{-1}(b),$$

for all $a, b \in B$. By a subgroup of a left brace B we mean a subgroup of the multiplicative group of B.

Given a solution (X, r) of the YBE, the groups $G(X, r)$ and $\mathcal{G}(X, r)$ each have a natural left brace structure. The additive group of $G(X, r)$ is the free abelian group with basis X and $\lambda_x(y) = \sigma_x(y)$, for all $x, y \in X \subseteq G(X, r)$. Furthermore, the map $x \mapsto \sigma_x$ extends to an onto (multiplicative) group homomorphism

$$\phi \colon G(X, r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(X, r)$$

and $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi) = \mathrm{Soc}(G(X, r))$ is an ideal of the left brace $G(X, r)$. Hence

$$\mathcal{G}(X, r) \cong G(X, r)/\,\mathrm{Soc}(G(X, r))$$

has a natural induced left brace structure (see also [37, Section 3] and [20, Sections 3 and 5]). It follows that $\phi : G(X, r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(X, r)$ is a homomorphism of left braces and, for every $g \in G(X, r)$, the map $\phi(g)$ is the restriction of λ_g to X. In particular, $\phi(a + b) = \phi(a) + \phi(b)$, where the latter is the sum taken in the brace $\mathcal{G}(X, r)$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let (X, r) be a solution of the YBE such that* $\mathrm{Ret}(X, r) = (X, r)$. *Then* $\mathrm{Soc}(\mathcal{G}(X, r)) = \{1\}$.

Proof. We have that $r(x, y) = (\sigma_x(y), \sigma^{-1}_{\sigma_x(y)}(x))$, for some $\sigma_x \in \mathrm{Sym}(X)$. Let $g \in \mathrm{Soc}(\mathcal{G}(X, r))$. Then there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in X$ and $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that $g = \sigma_{x_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \sigma_{x_n}^{\varepsilon_n}$ and $gh - g = h$ for all $h \in \mathcal{G}(X, r)$. In particular, for all $z \in X$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_z &= g\sigma_z - g \\
&= \sigma_{x_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \sigma_{x_n}^{\varepsilon_n} \sigma_z - \sigma_{x_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \sigma_{x_n}^{\varepsilon_n} \\
&= \phi(x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n} z - x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n}) \\
&= \phi(\lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n}}(z)) \\
&= \sigma_{\lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n}}(z)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since, by assumption, $\mathrm{Ret}(X,r) = (X,r)$ we get that $\lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1}\cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n}}(z) = z$, for all $z \in X$. Thus

$$g = \sigma_{x_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \sigma_{x_n}^{\varepsilon_n} = \phi(x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n}) = \mathrm{id}_X,$$

and therefore $\mathrm{Soc}(\mathcal{G}(X,r)) = \{1\}$. ∎

Clearly, the converse of this result is not true. For example, let $X = \{1,2\}$ and let $r\colon X^2 \longrightarrow X^2$ be defined by $r(x,y) = (y,x)$. Then (X,r) is a solution of the YBE, $\mathrm{Ret}(X,r) \neq (X,r)$ and $\mathrm{Soc}(\mathcal{G}(X,r)) = \{1\}$. What is true is the following:

Remark 2.2 If B is a left brace with $\mathrm{Soc}(B) = \{1\}$, then there exists a solution (X,r) such that $\mathcal{G}(X,r) \cong B$ as left braces, and $\mathrm{Ret}(X,r) = (X,r)$. Indeed, consider the associated solution of B: $X = B$ and the map r is given by

$$\begin{array}{rccc} r: & B \times B & \longrightarrow & B \times B \\ & (a,b) & \mapsto & (\lambda_a(b), \lambda^{-1}_{\lambda_a(b)}(a)). \end{array}$$

Note that,

$$\mathcal{G}(X,r) = \langle \lambda_a \mid a \in B \rangle = \{\lambda_a \mid a \in B\} \cong B/\operatorname{Soc}(B) = B.$$

Moreover, $\mathrm{Ret}(X,r) = (X,r)$, because if $\lambda_{a_1} = \lambda_{a_2}$, then $\lambda_{a_2^{-1}a_1} = \mathrm{id}$, and since the socle is trivial, $a_2^{-1}a_1 = 1$.

If B is a finite non-trivial two-sided brace, then $\mathrm{Soc}(B) \neq \{1\}$ [11, Proposition 3]. By Lemma 2.1, any such solution (X,r) with $\mathcal{G}(X,r) \cong B$ satisfies $\mathrm{Ret}(X,r) \neq (X,r)$. In fact, (X,r) is a multipermutation solution, (see [20, Corollary 5.17] or the proof of [11, Theorem 3] and the comments after this proof). Hence to study finite non-multipermutation solutions, one should consider only finite left braces which are not two-sided.

Lemma 2.3 *Let (X,r) be a solution of the YBE and let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be the family of all orbits of X under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X,r)$. Suppose $\leq$ is a well-order on I. For each $i \in I$ denote by G_i the subgroup of $G(X,r)$ generated by X_i. Then*

(i) G_i is a subbrace of $G(X,r)$, invariant by the action of $\mathcal{G}(X,r)$.

(ii) $G_iG_j = G_jG_i$ for all $i,j \in I$.

(iii) Every $g \in G(X,r) \setminus \{1\}$ has a unique presentation as a product $g = g_1 \cdots g_m$, where $g_j \in G_{i_j} \setminus \{1\}$, for $j = 1,\ldots,m$, and $i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ are elements of I. Moreover, g can be presented uniquely as a sum $g = h_1 + \cdots + h_m$, where $h_j \in G_{i_j} \setminus \{1\}$, for $j = 1,\ldots,m$, and $i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ are elements of I.

Proof. Let G_i^+ be the additive subgroup of $G(X,r)$ generated by X_i. We shall prove that $G_i^+ = G_i$. Let $g \in G_i$. Then there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in X_i$ and integers $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_k \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that $g = x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_k^{\varepsilon_k}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} g &= x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_k^{\varepsilon_k} \\ &= x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_{k-1}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}} + \lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_{k-1}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}}}(x_k^{\varepsilon_k}) \\ &= x_1^{\varepsilon_1} + \lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1}}(x_2^{\varepsilon_2}) + \lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2}}(x_3^{\varepsilon_3}) + \cdots + \lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots x_{k-1}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}}}(x_k^{\varepsilon_k}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_i^{-1} = -\lambda_{x_i^{-1}}(x_i)$, it is clear that $G_i \subseteq G_i^+$. Let $h \in G_i^+$. Then there exist $y_1, \ldots y_t \in X_i$ and integers $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_t \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that $h = \nu_1 y_1 + \cdots + \nu_t y_t$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} h &= \nu_1 y_1 + \cdots + \nu_t y_t \\ &= (\nu_1 y_1 + \cdots + \nu_{t-1} y_{t-1}) \lambda^{-1}_{\nu_1 y_1 + \cdots + \nu_{t-1} y_{t-1}}(\nu_t y_t) \\ &= (\nu_1 y_1) \lambda^{-1}_{\nu_1 y_1}(\nu_2 y_2) \lambda^{-1}_{\nu_1 y_1 + \nu_2 y_2}(\nu_3 y_3) \cdots \lambda^{-1}_{\nu_1 y_1 + \cdots + \nu_{t-1} y_{t-1}}(\nu_t y_t). \end{aligned}$$

Since $-y_i = (\lambda^{-1}_{-y_i}(y_i))^{-1}$, it is clear that $G_i^+ \subseteq G_i$. Hence $G_i^+ = G_i$. Therefore G_i is a subbrace of $G(X,r)$ and clearly it is invariant under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X,r)$. This proves (i).

By (i), we know that $\lambda_g(G_i) = G_i$, for all $g \in G(X,r)$ and $i \in I$. Let $g \in G_i$ and $h \in G_j$. By [11, Lemma 2(i)], $gh = \lambda_g(h) \lambda^{-1}_{\lambda_g(h)}(g) \in G_j G_i$. Therefore $G_i G_j \subseteq G_j G_i$. Thus (ii) follows by symmetry.

Therefore, for every $g \in G(X,r) \setminus \{1\}$, there exist a positive integer m, $i_1, \ldots, i_m \in I$ and $g_j \in G_{i_j}$, for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, such that $i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ and $g = g_1 \cdots g_m$. Suppose that $g_1 \cdots g_m = g_1' \cdots g_m'$, for $g_j, g_j' \in G_{i_j}$. Then, by the above,

$$\begin{aligned} g_1^{-1} g_1' &= g_2 \cdots g_m (g_m')^{-1} \cdots (g_2')^{-1} \\ &= g_2 + \lambda_{g_2}(g_3) + \cdots + \lambda_{g_2 \cdots g_{m-1}}(g_m) + \lambda_{g_2 \cdots g_m}((g_m')^{-1}) \\ &\quad + \cdots + \lambda_{g_2 \cdots g_m (g_m')^{-1} \cdots (g_3')^{-1}}((g_2')^{-1}) \in G_1^+ \cap (G_2^+ + \cdots + G_m^+). \end{aligned}$$

Since the additive group of $G(X,r)$ is free abelian with basis X, we have that $G_1^+ \cap (G_2^+ + \cdots + G_m^+) = \{0\}$. Hence $g_1 = g_1'$. By induction on m, it follows that $g_j = g_j'$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Let $h_1 = g_1$ and $h_i = \lambda_{g_1 \cdots g_{i-1}}(g_i)$, for $1 < i \leq m$. We have $g = h_1 + \cdots + h_m$ and $h_j \in G_{i_j} \setminus \{1\}$, for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Therefore, (iii) follows. ∎

Let (X,r) be a solution of the YBE. We know that $G(X,r)$ is a group presented with the set of generators X and with relations $xy = zt$ whenever $r(x,y) = (z,t)$. Since the relations are homogeneous, the group $G(X,r)$ has a degree function $\deg\colon G(X,r) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\deg(x) = 1$, for all $x \in X$. Therefore, for $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m \in X$ and $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\deg(x_1^{n_1} \cdots x_m^{n_m}) = \sum_{l=1}^m n_l$.

Remark 2.4 Since $(G(X,r),+) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{(X)}$, we can also define an additive degree function $\deg_+$ as follows $\deg_+(n_1x_1+\cdots+n_mx_m) = \sum_{l=1}^{m} n_l$, for $x_1,\ldots,x_m \in X$ and $n_1,\ldots,n_m \in \mathbb{Z}$. In fact, the two functions coincide.

Indeed, take an arbitrary element $g = x_1^{\varepsilon_1}\cdots x_k^{\varepsilon_k}$ of $G(X,r)$, where $x_1,\ldots x_k \in X$ and $\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_k \in \{-1,1\}$. Note that $\deg(g) = \sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon_i$. As seen before, in a left brace, we can pass from the multiplicative form to the additive form through the lambda maps, and this in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} g &= x_1^{\varepsilon_1}\cdots x_k^{\varepsilon_k} \\ &= x_1^{\varepsilon_1} + \lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1}}(x_2^{\varepsilon_2}) + \lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1}x_2^{\varepsilon_2}}(x_3^{\varepsilon_3}) + \cdots + \lambda_{x_1^{\varepsilon_1}\cdots x_{k-1}^{\varepsilon_{k-1}}}(x_k^{\varepsilon_k}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_i^{-1} = -\lambda_{x_i^{-1}}(x_i)$ and $\lambda_h(x) \in X$ for any $h \in G(X,r)$ and any $x \in X$, it is clear that there exist $y_1,\ldots,y_k \in X$ such that

$$g = \varepsilon_1 y_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_k y_k.$$

So we get $\deg_+(g) = \sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon_i = \deg(g)$, as claimed.

Now that we know that $\deg_+ = \deg$, we can prove some properties of this function: for any $g,h \in G(X,r)$,

(a) $\deg(\lambda_g(h)) = \deg(h)$. We use the additive definition $\deg_+$ of the function. Assume $h = \varepsilon_1x_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_kx_k$, where $x_1,\ldots,x_k \in X$ and $\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_k \in \{-1,1\}$. Then $\lambda_g(h) = \varepsilon_1\lambda_g(x_1) + \cdots + \varepsilon_k\lambda_g(x_k)$, and since $\lambda_g(x) \in X$ for any $g \in G$ and $x \in X$, $\deg(\lambda_g(h)) = \deg_+(\lambda_g(h)) = \sum_{i=1}^{k}\varepsilon_i = \deg(h)$.

(b) $\deg(g+h) = \deg(g)+\deg(h)$. This is a direct consequence of the application of the additive function $\deg_+$.

(c) $\deg(g \cdot h) = \deg(g) + \deg(h)$. This follows from the definition of deg.

We will use all these facts in the proof of the next lemma.

Lemma 2.5 *Let (X,r) be a solution of the YBE. Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be the family of all orbits of X under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X,r)$. Let G_i be the subgroup of $G(X,r)$ generated by X_i. Let $\leq$ be a well-order on I. Let $H = \{g_1\cdots g_n \mid g_l \in G_{i_l}$, for $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n$ in I and $\deg(g_l) = 0\} = \{g_1 + \cdots + g_n \mid g_l \in G_{i_l}$, for $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n$ in I and $\deg(g_l) = 0\}$. Then H is an ideal of the left brace $G(X,r)$.*

Proof. The set $\{g_1\cdots g_n \mid g_l \in G_{i_l}$, for $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n$ in I and $\deg(g_l) = 0\}$ is equal to $\{g_1 + \cdots + g_n \mid g_l \in G_{i_l}$, for $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n$ in I and $\deg(g_l) = 0\}$ because of Lemma 2.3 and the fact that the multiplicative and the additive degree coincide. Hence H is well-defined.

By the definition of H in multiplicative terms and Lemma 2.3, it is easy to see that H is a normal subgroup of $G(X,r)$. Let $h \in H$ and $g \in G(X,r)$. There

exist elements $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n$ in I and $g_l \in G_{i_l}$ such that $h = g_1 + \cdots + g_n$ and $\deg(g_l) = 0$ for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_g(h) &= \lambda_g(g_1 + \cdots + g_n) \\ &= \lambda_g(g_1) + \lambda_g(g_2) + \cdots + \lambda_g(g_n). \end{aligned}$$

Now $\lambda_g(g_l) \in G_l$ and $\deg(\lambda_g(g_l)) = \deg(g_l) = 0$, so H is λ_g-invariant and the assertion follows. ∎

3 The main construction

In this section we construct a new family of irretractable square-free solutions of the YBE. These will be strong twisted unions of multipermutation solutions of multipermutation level 2.

Strong twisted unions of solutions of the YBE were introduced in [22, Definition 5.1]. In fact, the original definition only covered the union of two quadratic sets. The general definition appeared later in [21, Definition 3.5]. Recall that a solution (X, r) of the YBE is a strong twisted union of a set of solutions $\{(X_j, r_j) \mid j \in J\}$, with $1 < |J|$, if the sets X_j are $\mathcal{G}(X, r)$-invariant subsets of X, $X = \bigcup_{j \in J} X_j$, $X_j \cap X_k = \emptyset$ for $j \neq k$, r_j is the restriction of r to X_j^2 and, for all $j, k \in J$ such that $j \neq k$,

$$\sigma_{\gamma_x(z)}(y) = \sigma_z(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{\sigma_z(x)}(t) = \gamma_x(t), \tag{1}$$

for all $x, y \in X_j$, $z, t \in X_k$, where $r(a, b) = (\sigma_a(b), \gamma_b(a))$, for all $a, b \in X$.

Let A and B be a nontrivial (additive) abelian groups. Let I be a set with $|I| > 1$ and let $X(A, B, I) = A \times B \times I$. Let $\varphi_1 \colon A \longrightarrow B$ be a map of sets such that $\varphi_1(-a) = \varphi_1(a)$ for all $a \in A$. Let $\varphi_2 \colon B \longrightarrow A$ be a homomorphism of groups. For $a \in A$, $b \in B$ and $i \in I$, let $\sigma_{(a,b,i)} \colon X(A, B, I) \longrightarrow X(A, B, I)$ be the map defined by

$$\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(c, d, j) = \begin{cases} (c, d + \varphi_1(a - c), j) & \text{if } i = j, \\ (c + \varphi_2(b), d, j) & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

for all $c \in A$, $d \in B$ and $j \in I$. Note that $\sigma_{(a,b,i)}$ is bijective and

$$\sigma^{-1}_{(a,b,i)}(c, d, j) = \begin{cases} (c, d - \varphi_1(a - c), j) & \text{if } i = j, \\ (c - \varphi_2(b), d, j) & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

for all $c \in A$, $d \in B$ and $j \in I$.

Let $r \colon X(A, B, I)^2 \longrightarrow X(A, B, I)^2$ be defined by

$$r((a, b, i), (c, d, j)) = (\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(c, d, j), \sigma^{-1}_{\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j)}(a, b, i)).$$

For $i \in I$, put $X_i = A \times B \times \{i\}$. Clearly we have that $r^2 = \mathrm{id}_{X(A,B,I)^2}$, i.e. r is involutive.

Lemma 3.1 *For $c \in A$, $d \in B$ and $j \in I$, let $\gamma_{(c,d,j)} \colon X(A,B,I) \longrightarrow X(A,B,I)$ be the map defined by*

$$\gamma_{(c,d,j)}(a,b,i) = \sigma^{-1}_{\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j)}(a,b,i),$$

for all $a \in A$, $b \in B$ and $i \in I$. Then $\gamma_{(c,d,j)}$ is bijective and

$$\gamma^{-1}_{(c,d,j)} = \sigma_{(c,d,j)}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\sigma^{-1}_{\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j)}(a,b,i) = \begin{cases} (a, b - \varphi_1(c-a), i) & \text{if } i = j, \\ (a - \varphi_2(d), b, i) & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Therefore the result follows. ∎

Remark 3.2 Lemma 3.1 means that $(X(A,B,I),r)$ satisfies condition **lri** (see [20, Definition 2.6]). By [20, Fact 2.7] every square-free solution of the Yang-Baxter equation satisfies condition **lri**. But the converse is not true. By [20, Fact 2.8], since $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is involutive and satisfies **lri**, we have that $(X(A,B,I),r)$ also is cyclic (see [20, Definition 2.6]). In [20] Gateva-Ivanova continued her systematic study of solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation with these important conditions.

Theorem 3.3 *$(X(A,B,I),r)$ is a solution of the YBE and the following conditions hold.*

(i) $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is square-free if and only if $\varphi_1(0) = 0$.

(ii) If $\varphi_1^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$ and φ_2 is injective, then $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is irretractable.

(iii) Every X_i is invariant under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$, and if r_i is the restriction of r to X_i^2, then (X_i, r_i) is a multipermutation solution of multipermutation level at most two and $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is a strong twisted union of the solutions (X_i, r_i).

(iv) If $\varphi_1(A)$ generates B as a group and φ_2 is surjective, then the orbits for the action of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ on $X(A,B,I)$ are X_i, for $i \in I$.

Proof. We know that r is involutive. By Lemma 3.1, r is non-degenerate. Furthermore

$$r((a,b,i),(c,d,j)) = (\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j), \sigma^{-1}_{(c,d,j)}(a,b,i)). \tag{2}$$

By [11, Proposition 2], to prove that $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is a solution of the YBE it is enough to check that

$$\sigma_{(a,b,i)}\sigma_{\sigma^{-1}_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j)} = \sigma_{(c,d,j)}\sigma_{\sigma^{-1}_{(c,d,j)}(a,b,i)},$$

for all $a, c \in A$, $b, d \in B$ and $i, j \in I$. Since $\varphi_1(-a) = \varphi_1(a)$ and φ_2 is a homomorphism of groups, these equalities follow at once from the following two formulas, where $e \in A$, $f \in B$ and $k \in I$.

$$\sigma_{(a,b,i)}\sigma_{\sigma^{-1}_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j)}(e,f,k)$$
$$= \begin{cases} (e, f + \varphi_1(c-e) + \varphi_1(a-e), k) & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(d - \varphi_1(a-c)) + \varphi_2(b), f, k) & \text{if } i = j \neq k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(b), f + \varphi_1(c - \varphi_2(b) - e), k) & \text{if } i \neq j = k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(d), f + \varphi_1(a - e - \varphi_2(d)), k) & \text{if } j \neq i = k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(d) + \varphi_2(b), f, k) & \text{if } j \neq i, i \neq k \\ & \text{and } j \neq k, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sigma_{(c,d,j)}\sigma_{\sigma^{-1}_{(c,d,j)}(a,b,i)}(e,f,k)$$
$$= \begin{cases} (e, f + \varphi_1(a-e) + \varphi_1(c-e), k) & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(b - \varphi_1(c-a)) + \varphi_2(d), f, k) & \text{if } i = j \neq k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(b), f + \varphi_1(c - e - \varphi_2(b)), k) & \text{if } i \neq j = k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(d), f + \varphi_1(a - \varphi_2(d) - e), k) & \text{if } j \neq i = k, \\ (e + \varphi_2(b) + \varphi_2(d), f, k) & \text{if } j \neq i, i \neq k \\ & \text{and } j \neq k. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, indeed $(X(A,B,I), r)$ is a solution of the YBE.

(i) Note that $\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(a,b,i) = (a, b + \varphi_1(0), i)$. Hence $(X(A,B,I), r)$ is square-free if and only if $\varphi_1(0) = 0$.

(ii) Suppose that $\varphi_1^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$ and that φ_2 is injective. Let $(a,b,i), (c,d,j) \in X(A,B,I)$ be two distinct elements. If $i \neq j$, then $\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(e,f,i) = (e, f+\varphi_1(a-e), i)$ and $\sigma_{(c,d,j)}(e,f,i) = (e + \varphi_2(d), f, i)$. Since $A \neq \{0\}$, we can take $e \in A$ such that $\varphi_1(a-e) \neq 0$. Therefore, if $i \neq j$, then $\sigma_{(a,b,i)} \neq \sigma_{(c,d,j)}$. Suppose that $i = j$. Then $(a,b) \neq (c,d)$. If $a \neq c$, then $\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,i) = (c, d+\varphi_1(a-c), i)$ and $\sigma_{(c,d,j)}(c,d,i) = (c,d,i)$. Thus, in this case, since $\varphi_1(a-c) \neq 0$, $\sigma_{(a,b,i)} \neq \sigma_{(c,d,j)}$. Suppose $i = j$ and $a = c$. Then $b \neq d$, and for $k \in I \setminus \{i\}$ there are equalities $\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(0,0,k) = (\varphi_2(b), 0, k)$ and $\sigma_{(c,d,j)}(0,0,k) = (\varphi_2(d), 0, k)$, which by the injectivity of φ_2, imply again $\sigma_{(a,b,i)} \neq \sigma_{(c,d,j)}$. Thus we have shown that $\sigma_{(a,b,i)} = \sigma_{(c,d,j)}$ if and only if $(a,b,i) = (c,d,j)$. Therefore $\mathrm{Ret}(X(A,B,I), r) = (X(A,B,I), r)$.

(iii) It follows from the definition of r that each X_i is invariant under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I), r)$. Let $\sigma_{(a,b,i)}|_{X_i}$ be the restriction of $\sigma_{(a,b,i)}$ to the set $X_i = A \times B \times \{i\}$. It is easy to check that

$$\sigma_{(a,b,i)}|_{X_i} = \sigma_{(c,d,i)}|_{X_i}$$

if $a = c$. Since

$$r((a,b,i),(c,d,i)) = ((c, d + \varphi_1(a-c), i), (a, b - \varphi_1(c-a), i)),$$

one easily gets that $\mathrm{Ret}(X_i, r_i)$ is a trivial solution and thus $\mathrm{Ret}^2(X_i, r_i)$ is a solution on a set of cardinality 1. Therefore (X_i, r_i) is a multipermutation

solution of multipermutation level at most two. Let i, j be distinct elements in I. To show that $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is a strong twisted union of the solutions (X_i, r_i), in view of (1) and (2), we should check that

$$\sigma_{\sigma^{-1}_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j)}(e,f,i) = \sigma_{(c,d,j)}(e,f,i)$$

and

$$\sigma^{-1}_{\sigma_{(e,f,j)}(c,d,i)}(a,b,j) = \sigma^{-1}_{(c,d,i)}(a,b,j),$$

for all $a, c, e \in A$ and $b, d, f \in B$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\sigma^{-1}_{(a,b,i)}(c,d,j)}(e,f,i) &= \sigma_{(c-\varphi_2(b),d,j)}(e,f,i) \\
&= (e+\varphi_2(d), f, i) \\
&= \sigma_{(c,d,j)}(e,f,i), \quad \text{and} \\
\sigma^{-1}_{\sigma_{(e,f,j)}(c,d,i)}(a,b,j) &= \sigma^{-1}_{(c+\varphi_2(f),d,i)}(a,b,j) \\
&= (a-\varphi_2(d), b, j) \\
&= \sigma^{-1}_{(c,d,i)}(a,b,j).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, indeed, $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is a strong twisted union of the solutions (X_i, r_i).

(iv) Suppose that $\varphi_1(A)$ generates B and that φ_2 is surjective. Let $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. There exist $a_1, \ldots, a_s \in A$, $d \in B$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $b = z_1\varphi_1(a_1) + \cdots + z_s\varphi_1(a_s)$ and $\varphi_2(d) = a$. Note that if $i \neq k$, then $\sigma_{(0,d,i)}(0,0,k) = (a,0,k)$ and $\sigma^{z_1}_{(a_1+a,0,k)} \cdots \sigma^{z_s}_{(a_s+a,0,k)}(a,0,k) = (a,b,k)$. Hence the orbit of $(0,0,k)$ is $A \times B \times \{k\}$, and this finishes the proof. ∎

Remark 3.4 For $A = B = \mathbb{Z}/(2)$ and $I = \{1,2\}$ the solution $(X(A,B,I),r)$ of the above theorem, with $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = \mathrm{id}_A$, is isomorphic to the solution of [38, Example 3.9]. Recall that two solutions (X,r) and (X',r') of the YBE are isomorphic if there exists a bijective map $\eta : X \longrightarrow X'$ such that

$$r'(\eta(x),\eta(y)) = (\eta(\sigma_x(y)), \eta(\gamma_y(x))),$$

where $r(x,y) = (\sigma_x(y), \gamma_y(x))$, for $x, y \in X$.

Recall that Gateva-Ivanova conjectured that every finite square-free solution of the YBE is a multipermutation solution [19, Strong Conjecture 2.28(I)]. The construction of Vendramin, given in Remark 3.4, was the first counterexample to this conjecture. In fact, he constructed a family of counterexamples consisting of extensions of the one given above, i.e. square-free solutions (Y,s) such that there exists a surjective homomorphism $Y \longrightarrow X$ of solutions, where X is the solution $(X(A,B,I),r)$ given in Remark 3.4. Notice that [11, Lemma 4] implies that these solutions are not multipermutation solutions. However, we do not know whether these solutions are irretractable.

Perhaps Gateva-Ivanova expected that her conjecture might be too strong, because the following related question was formulated in [21].

Question 1. [21, Open Questions 6.13 (II)(4)] Let (X, r) be a square-free solution of the YBE. Suppose that (X, r) is a strong twisted union of two solutions of the YBE. Is it true that (X, r) is a multipermutation solution?

Notice also that there are examples of square-free multipermutation solutions of the YBE which are not a strong twisted union of two solutions of the YBE, see [10, Theorem 3.1].

Remark 3.5 The solutions $(X(A, B, I), r)$, with $\varphi_1^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$ and φ_2 injective, are new counterexamples to [19, Strong Conjecture 2.28(I)], and if moreover $|I| = 2$, then they answer in the negative Question 1. Note that if $\varphi_1^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$, then $\sigma_{(0,0,i)}|_{X_i} \neq \sigma_{(a,0,i)}|_{X_i}$ for all $a \neq 0$, thus, in this case, the multipermutation level of (X_i, r_i) is 2. The solution constructed by Vendramin [38, Example 3.6] also gives a negative answer to Question 1, but this fact is not noticed in [38].

4 The permutation group and the structure group of $(X(A, B, I), r)$

First we will study the structure of the multiplicative group of the left brace $\mathcal{G}(X(A, B, I), r)$.

Let G and H be two abelian groups, and let W be the set of all functions $f\colon H \longrightarrow G$. Then W is an abelian group with the sum $f_1 + f_2$ defined by $(f_1 + f_2)(h) = f_1(h) + f_2(h)$, for $f_1, f_2 \in W$ and $h \in H$. Recall that the complete wreath product $G \bar{\wr} H$ can be defined as the semidirect product $W \rtimes H$ with respect to the action of H on W defined by $(hf)(x) = f(x - h)$, for $f \in W$ and $h \in H$. The wreath product $G \wr H$ is defined similarly, but replacing W by the abelian group W' of all functions $f\colon H \longrightarrow G$ such that the set $\{h \in H : f(h) \neq 0\}$ is finite. Obviously, when H is finite, the complete wreath product and the wreath product coincide.

Proposition 4.1 *The permutation group $\mathcal{G}(X(A, B, I), r)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of the Cartesian product of $|I|$ copies of the complete wreath product $\langle\varphi_1(A)\rangle \bar{\wr} A$. In particular, if moreover A and B are finite abelian p-groups, and I is finite, then $\mathcal{G}(X(A, B, I), r)$ is a finite p-group.*

Proof. Let $B_1 = \langle\varphi_1(A)\rangle$. Let W be the set of all functions $f : A \longrightarrow B_1$. Consider the set $S = \{\sigma_{(a,b,i)} \mid a \in A,\ b \in B,\ i \in I\}$. Denote the Cartesian product of $|I|$ copies of $W \rtimes A$ by $(W \rtimes A)^I$ and its elements by $((f_j, a_j))_{j\in I}$, with $f_j \in W$ and $a_j \in A$. For each $a \in A$, let $f_a \in W$ denote the map defined by $f_a(x) = \varphi_1(a - x)$, for all $x \in A$. We define a map $\nu\colon S \longrightarrow (W \rtimes A)^I$ by $\nu(\sigma_{(a,b,i)}) = ((f_j, a_j))_{j\in I}$, where

$$f_j = \begin{cases} f_a & \text{if } j = i, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \in I \setminus \{i\}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad a_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j = i, \\ \varphi_2(b) & \text{if } j \in I \setminus \{i\}. \end{cases}$$

We claim that ν can be extended to an injective homomorphism

$$\nu\colon \mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r) \longrightarrow (W \rtimes A)^I.$$

Let $a_1,\dots,a_r \in A$, $b_1,\dots,b_r \in B$, $i_1,\dots,i_r \in I$ and $\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_r \in \{-1,1\}$. To prove the claim it is enough to prove that

$$\sigma^{\varepsilon_1}_{(a_1,b_1,i_1)} \cdots \sigma^{\varepsilon_r}_{(a_r,b_r,i_r)} = \mathrm{id}_{X(A,B,I)}$$

if and only if

$$((f_{r,j},a_{r,j})^{-\varepsilon_r})_{j\in I} \cdots ((f_{1,j},a_{1,j})^{-\varepsilon_1})_{j\in I} = ((0,0))_{j\in I},$$

where

$$f_{k,j} = \begin{cases} f_{a_k} & \text{if } j = i_k, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \in I \setminus \{i_k\}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad a_{k,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j = i_k, \\ \varphi_2(b_k) & \text{if } j \in I \setminus \{i_k\}. \end{cases}$$

We know that

$$\begin{aligned}
&((f_{r,j},a_{r,j})^{-\varepsilon_r})_{j\in I} \cdots ((f_{1,j},a_{1,j})^{-\varepsilon_1})_{j\in I} \\
&\quad = \left(\left(\left(\frac{-\varepsilon_r-1}{2}a_{r,j}\right)(-\varepsilon_r f_{r,j}), -\varepsilon_r a_{r,j}\right)\right)_{j\in I} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdots \left(\left(\left(\frac{-\varepsilon_1-1}{2}a_{1,j}\right)(-\varepsilon_1 f_{1,j}), -\varepsilon_1 a_{1,j}\right)\right)_{j\in I} \\
&\quad = \left(\left(\sum_{l=1}^{r}\left(\sum_{l<k\le r} -\varepsilon_k a_{k,j}\right)\left(\left(\frac{-\varepsilon_l-1}{2}a_{l,j}\right)(-\varepsilon_l f_{l,j})\right), -\sum_{k=1}^{r}\varepsilon_k a_{k,j}\right)\right)_{j\in I}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma^{\varepsilon_1}_{(a_1,b_1,i_1)} \cdots \sigma^{\varepsilon_r}_{(a_r,b_r,i_r)}(x,y,j) \\
&\quad = \sigma^{\varepsilon_1}_{(a_1,b_1,i_1)} \cdots \sigma^{\varepsilon_{r-1}}_{(a_{r-1},b_{r-1},i_{r-1})}(x + (1-\delta_{i_r,j})\varepsilon_r\varphi_2(b_r), \\
&\qquad\qquad y + \delta_{i_r,j}\varepsilon_r\varphi_1(a_r - x), j) \\
&\quad = \sigma^{\varepsilon_1}_{(a_1,b_1,i_1)} \cdots \sigma^{\varepsilon_{r-2}}_{(a_{r-2},b_{r-2},i_{r-2})}\left(x + \sum_{k=r-1}^{r}(1-\delta_{i_k,j})\varepsilon_k\varphi_2(b_k)\,,\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. y + \sum_{l=r-1}^{r}\delta_{i_l,j}\varepsilon_l\varphi_1\left(a_l - x - \sum_{l<k\le r}(1-\delta_{i_k,j})\varepsilon_k\varphi_2(b_k)\right), j\right) \\
&\quad = \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&\quad = \left(x + \sum_{k=1}^{r}(1-\delta_{i_k,j})\varepsilon_k\varphi_2(b_k),\right. \\
&\qquad \left. y + \sum_{l=1}^{r}\delta_{i_l,j}\varepsilon_l\varphi_1\left(a_l - x - \sum_{l<k\le r}(1-\delta_{i_k,j})\varepsilon_k\varphi_2(b_k)\right), j\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta, that is

$$\delta_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\sigma^{\varepsilon_1}_{(a_1,b_1,i_1)} \cdots \sigma^{\varepsilon_r}_{(a_r,b_r,i_r)} = \mathrm{id}_{X(A,B,I)}$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r} (1 - \delta_{i_k,j}) \varepsilon_k \varphi_2(b_k) = 0$$

and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{r} \delta_{i_l,j} \varepsilon_l \varphi_1 \left(a_l - x - \sum_{l<k\leq r} (1 - \delta_{i_k,j}) \varepsilon_k \varphi_2(b_k) \right) = 0,$$

for all $j \in I$ and all $x \in A$. Note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r} \varepsilon_k a_{k,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{r} (1 - \delta_{i_k,j}) \varepsilon_k \varphi_2(b_k)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{l=1}^{r} \left(\sum_{l<k\leq r} -\varepsilon_k a_{k,j} \right) \left(\left(\frac{-\varepsilon_l - 1}{2} a_{l,j} \right) (-\varepsilon_l f_{l,j}) \right) \right) (x) \\
&= -\sum_{l=1}^{r} \varepsilon_l f_{l,j} \left(x - \frac{-\varepsilon_l - 1}{2} a_{l,j} - \sum_{l<k\leq r} -\varepsilon_k a_{k,j} \right) \\
&= -\sum_{l=1}^{r} \delta_{i_l,j} \varepsilon_l \varphi_1 \left(a_l - x - \frac{\varepsilon_l + 1}{2} a_{l,j} - \sum_{l<k\leq r} \varepsilon_k a_{k,j} \right) \\
&= -\sum_{l=1}^{r} \delta_{i_l,j} \varepsilon_l \varphi_1 \left(a_l - x - (1 - \delta_{i_l,j}) \frac{\varepsilon_l + 1}{2} \varphi_2(b_l) \right. \\
&\qquad \left. - \sum_{l<k\leq r} (1 - \delta_{i_k,j}) \varepsilon_k \varphi_2(b_k) \right) \\
&= -\sum_{l=1}^{r} \delta_{i_l,j} \varepsilon_l \varphi_1 \left(a_l - x - \sum_{l<k\leq r} (1 - \delta_{i_k,j}) \varepsilon_k \varphi_2(b_k) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last equality, the term $(1 - \delta_{i_l,j}) \frac{\varepsilon_l + 1}{2} \varphi_2(b_l)$ disappears because, when $(1 - \delta_{i_l,j}) = 1$, then $\delta_{i_l,j} = 0$, whence the term

$$\delta_{i_l,j} \varepsilon_l \varphi_1 \left(a_l - x - (1 - \delta_{i_l,j}) \frac{\varepsilon_l + 1}{2} \varphi_2(b_l) - \sum_{l<k\leq r} (1 - \delta_{i_k,j}) \varepsilon_k \varphi_2(b_k) \right)$$

becomes zero, and does not appear in the sum. Therefore the claim is proved. ∎

With some additional hypothesis, we can determine precisely the permutation group of $(X(A,B,I),r)$. Note that the next result gives examples of solutions of the YBE with permutation group of arbitrarily large nilpotency class.

Corollary 4.2 *Assume that $A = B = \mathbb{Z}/(k)$, $k > 1$, I is a finite set such that $\gcd(|I|-1,k) = 1$, φ_2 is surjective, $\varphi_1(0) = 0$ and $\varphi_1(x) = 1$ for any $x \in A\backslash\{0\}$. Then, $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r) \cong (A \wr A)^{|I|}$.*

In this case, the derived length of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ is 2. The permutation group $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ is nilpotent if and only if $k = p^\alpha$ for some prime p, and, in this case, its nilpotency class is equal to $(\alpha(p-1)+1)p^{\alpha-1}$. In particular, if A is of prime order p then the nilpotency class is p.

Proof. First, observe that $\langle\varphi_1(A)\rangle = A$. By Proposition 4.1 (and its proof), we know that $\nu : \mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r) \longrightarrow (A \wr A)^{|I|}$ is injective. So, in order to prove the first claim it is enough to show that ν is surjective. As before, denote by f_a, $a \in A$, the map given by $f_a(c) = \varphi_1(a-c)$, for $c \in A$. First we prove that, by definition of φ_1, the set $\{f_a : a \in A\}$ generates the abelian group W consisting of the maps from A to A. Indeed, if f is any map from A to itself, we have to find $z_a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a \in A$, such that $f(c) = \sum_{a\in A} z_a f_a(c)$ for any $c \in A$. Observe that $\sum_{a\in A} z_a f_a(c) = \sum_{a\in A\backslash\{c\}} z_a$ by the definition of φ_1. This is a system of linear equations with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/(k)$ with k equations in k variables. The associated matrix of the system is

$$N_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in M_k(\mathbb{Z}/(k)).$$

One can prove that $\det(N_k) = (-1)^{k-1}(k-1)$, which is invertible in $\mathbb{Z}/(k)$, so the system has a solution.

Second, we prove that $S = \{s_j(f,b) : j \in I, b \in A, f \in W\}$, where $s_j(f,b) = ((f_i,b_i))_{i\in I}$ is an element of $(A \wr A)^{|I|}$ defined by

$$(f_i,b_i) = \begin{cases} (f,0) & \text{if } i = j, \\ (0,b) & \text{if } i \in I \setminus \{j\}, \end{cases}$$

is a set of generators of $(A \wr A)^{|I|}$. Given an arbitrary element $((f_i',c_i))_{i\in I}$ of $(A\bar{\wr}A)^{|I|}$, consider the equations $\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{j\}} x_i = c_j$, one for each $j \in I$, in the variables $\{x_i\}_{i\in I}$. Then this is a system of $|I|$ linear equations in $|I|$ variables, and its associated matrix is $N_{|I|}$. We know that $\det(N_{|I|}) = (-1)^{|I|-1}(|I|-1)$, so the system has a solution since, by the hypothesis, $\gcd(|I|-1,k) = 1$. Thus

there exist elements $\{b_i\}_{i\in I}$ in A such that $(\sum_{i\in I} b_i) - b_j = c_j$ for any $j \in I$. Define functions f_j, $j \in I$, by $f_j(c) = f'_j(c + \sum_{1\leq k<j} b_k)$ for any $c \in A$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&s_1(f_1, b_1) \cdot s_2(f_2, b_2) \cdots s_{|I|}(f_{|I|}, b_{|I|}) \\
&\quad = \quad ((f_1, 0), (0, b_1), \ldots, (0, b_1)) \cdot ((0, b_2), (f_2, 0), (0, b_2), \ldots, (0, b_2)) \cdots \\
&\qquad \cdot((0, b_{|I|}), \ldots, (0, b_{|I|}), (f_{|I|}, 0)) \\
&\quad = \quad \Bigg((f_1, \sum_{i\in I} b_i - b_1), (b_1 f_2, \sum_{i\in I} b_i - b_2), \ldots, \\
&\qquad\qquad ((b_1 + \cdots + b_{|I|-1}) f_{|I|}, \sum_{i\in I} b_i - b_{|I|}) \Bigg) \\
&\quad = \quad ((f'_i, c_i))_{i\in I},
\end{aligned}$$

showing that S is a set of generators of $(A \wr A)^{|I|}$, as claimed.

Thus, to prove that ν is surjective, it is enough to show that, for any $s_i(f, b)$ in S, there exists a $\tau \in \mathcal{G}(X(A, B, I), r)$ such that $\nu(\tau) = s_i(f, b)$. By what we checked at the beginning of this proof, there exist integers z_a, $a \in A$, such that $f = \sum_{a\in A} z_a f_a$. Assume $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_k\}$ with $a_1 = 0$, and denote $z_i = z_{a_i}$. On the other hand, choose $a \in A$ such that $\varphi_2(a) = b$ (using here that φ_2 is surjective). Then, define the element

$$\tau = \sigma_{(0,0,i)}^{z_1-1} \sigma_{(a_2,0,i)}^{z_2} \cdots \sigma_{(a_k,0,i)}^{z_k} \sigma_{(0,a,i)} \in \mathcal{G}(X(A, B, I), r).$$

Note that, by definition of ν, $\nu(\sigma_{(a,b,i)}) = s_i(f_a, \varphi_2(b))$. Moreover, $s_i(f, a) \cdot s_i(g, b) = s_i(f + g, a + b)$. These two facts explain the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(\tau) &= \nu(\sigma_{(0,0,i)})^{z_1-1} \cdot \nu(\sigma_{(a_2,0,i)})^{z_2} \cdots \nu(\sigma_{(a_k,0,i)})^{z_k} \cdot \nu(\sigma_{(0,a,i)}) \\
&= s_i(f_0, 0)^{z_1-1} \cdot s_i(f_{a_2}, 0)^{z_2} \cdots s_i(f_{a_k}, 0)^{z_k} \cdot s_i(f_0, \varphi_2(a)) \\
&= s_i\left((z_1 - 1) f_0 + \sum_{i=2}^{k} z_i f_{a_i} + f_0, \varphi_2(a) \right) \\
&= s_i(f, b).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, this finally shows that ν is surjective.

At this point, we have proved that $\mathcal{G}(X(A, B, I), r) \cong (A \wr A)^{|I|}$. Observe that $A \wr A$ is a semidirect product of two abelian groups, so its derived length is 2. It follows that $(A \wr A)^{|I|}$ also has derived length equal to 2. Concerning the nilpotency of $\mathcal{G}(X(A, B, I), r)$, recall that a direct product of groups $G \times H$ is nilpotent if and only if G and H are nilpotent. Besides, the results of [5] imply that a wreath product of two finite groups G and H is nilpotent if and only if G and H are p-groups for the same prime p. So, in our case, $(A \wr A)^{|I|}$ is nilpotent if and only if $A = \mathbb{Z}/(p^\alpha)$ for some prime p.

Moreover, it is possible to compute the nilpotency class of this wreath product. We use the following known result (see [27, Theorem 5.1]): the nilpotency

class of $G \wr H$, where G and H are finite abelian p-groups such that G has exponent p^n and $H \cong \mathbb{Z}/(p^{\beta_1}) \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}/(p^{\beta_m})$ with $\beta_1 \geq \cdots \geq \beta_m$, is equal to

$$(n-1)(p-1)p^{\beta_1-1} + 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{m}(p^{\beta_i} - 1).$$

Applying this result to $G = H = A = \mathbb{Z}/(p^\alpha)$, we get that the nilpotency class of $A \wr A$ is equal to

$$(\alpha p - \alpha + 1)p^{\alpha-1}.$$

The nilpotency class of $(A \wr A)^{|I|}$ is also equal to $(\alpha p - \alpha + 1)p^{\alpha-1}$ because the class of a direct product $G \times H$ is equal to the maximum of the class of G and the class of H.

Observe that, in particular, for $A = \mathbb{Z}/(p)$, we obtain nilpotency class equal to p. ∎

By Lemma 2.1, we know that $\mathrm{Soc}(\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)) = \{1\}$ if $(X(A,B,I),r)$ is irretractable. By Theorem 3.3, this happens if $\varphi_1^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$ and φ_2 is injective. In view of the strategy explained in the introduction, it would be interesting to know whether under some conditions on A, B, I, φ_1 and φ_2, the left brace $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ can be simple.

We do not know any new simple left brace of the form $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ and it seems difficult to study the ideal structure of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ in general. The next result shows that there are some non-trivial ideals in some cases where the socle is trivial. Although these left braces are not simple, maybe they can be used to construct new families of simple left braces with the techniques used in [3], because they have trivial socle.

Proposition 4.3 *Assume that $A = B = \mathbb{Z}/(k)$, $k > 1$, I is a finite set such that $\gcd(|I| - 1, k) = 1$, φ_2 is surjective, $\varphi_1(0) = 0$ and $\varphi_1(x) = 1$ for any $x \in A \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ is not a simple left brace.*

Proof. Let $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\}$ with $|I| = n$. Let G_i be the subgroup of the structure group $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ generated by $\{(a,b,i) \mid a,b \in A\}$. By Theorem 3$(iv)$, the sets $\{(a,b,i) \mid a,b \in A\}$ are the orbits of $X(A,B,I)$ under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$. Thus, by Lemma 2.3, every element g of $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ can be written uniquely as $g = g_1 \cdots g_n$, for some $g_l \in G_{i_l}$. Let $H = \{g_1 \cdots g_n \mid g_l \in G_{i_l} \text{ and } \deg(g_l) = 0\}$. By Lemma 2.5, H is an ideal of the left brace $G(X(A,B,I),r)$.

Let $\phi\colon G(X(A,B,I),r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ be the natural map. We shall prove that $\phi(H)$ is a non-trivial proper ideal of the left brace $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$.

Note that

$$\sigma^k_{(a,b,i)}(x,y,j) = (x + (1-\delta_{i,j})k\varphi_2(b), y + \delta_{i,j}k\varphi_1(a-x), j) = (x,y,j),$$

for all $a,b,x,y \in A$ and all $i,j \in I$. Hence $\phi((a,b,j)^k) = \sigma^k_{(a,b,i)} = \mathrm{id}$. We claim that

$$\mathrm{Ker}(\phi)H = \mathrm{gr}((a,b,i)^k \mid a,b \in A,\ i \in I)H. \tag{3}$$

It is clear that $\mathrm{gr}((a,b,i)^k \mid a,b \in A,\ i \in I)H \subseteq \mathrm{Ker}(\phi)H$. Let $g \in \mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$. By Lemma 2.3, there exist unique $g_1, \ldots, g_l \in G(X(A,B,I),r)$ such that $g = g_1 \cdots g_n$ and $g_l \in G_{i_l}$, for $l = 1, \ldots, n$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma_{(a,b,i)}\sigma_{(c,d,i)}(x,y,j)\\
&\quad = \quad (x + (1-\delta_{i,j})\varphi_2(d+b), y + \delta_{i,j}(\varphi_1(c-x) + \varphi_1(a-x)), j)\\
&\quad = \quad \sigma_{(c,d,i)}\sigma_{(a,b,i)}(x,y,j).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(a,b,i)^{-1}(c,d,i)^{-1}(a,b,i)(c,d,i) \in \mathrm{Ker}(\phi) \cap H$, for all $a,b,c,d \in A$ and all $i \in I$. Hence, to prove that $g \in \mathrm{gr}((a,b,i)^k \mid a,b \in A,\ i \in I)H$, we may assume that every g_l is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
g_l \quad = \quad & (0,0,i_l)^{z_{0,0,l}}(0,1,i_l)^{z_{0,1,l}} \cdots (0,k-1,i_l)^{z_{0,k-1,l}}\\
& (1,0,i_l)^{z_{1,0,l}}(1,1,i_l)^{z_{1,1,l}} \cdots (1,k-1,i_l)^{z_{1,k-1,l}}\\
& \cdots (k-1,0,i_l)^{z_{k-1,0,l}}(k-1,1,i_l)^{z_{k-1,1,l}} \cdots (k-1,k-1,i_l)^{z_{k-1,k-1,l}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{id} = \phi(g) = \left(\prod_{p,q=0}^{k-1} \sigma_{(p,q,i_1)}^{z_{p,q,1}}\right) \cdot \left(\prod_{p,q=0}^{k-1} \sigma_{(p,q,i_2)}^{z_{p,q,2}}\right) \cdots \left(\prod_{p,q=0}^{k-1} \sigma_{(p,q,i_n)}^{z_{p,q,n}}\right).$$

Therefore, for every $x, y \in A$ and $j \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(x,y,j) \quad = \quad & \left(x + \sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-\delta_{l,j})\varphi_2\left(\sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,l}q\right),\right.\\
& \left. y + \sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,j}\varphi_1\left(p - x - \sum_{l=j+1}^{n}\varphi_2\left(\sum_{p',q'=0}^{k-1} z_{p',q',l}q'\right)\right), j\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-\delta_{l,j})\varphi_2\left(\sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,l}q\right) = 0,$$

for all $j \in I$. Since A is finite and φ_2 is a surjective endomorphism of A, we have that φ_2 is an automorphism of A, and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-\delta_{l,j})\sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,l}q = 0,$$

for all $j \in I$. Note that the system of linear equations

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-\delta_{l,j})x_l = 0, \qquad \text{for } j \in I$$

over A has only the trivial solution $x_l = 0$ for all l, because $\gcd(|I|-1, k) = 1$. Therefore

$$\sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,l} q = 0,$$

for all l. On the other hand, we also have that

$$\sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,j} \varphi_1 \left(p - x - \sum_{l=j+1}^{n} \varphi_2 \left(\sum_{p',q'=0}^{k-1} z_{p',q',l} q' \right) \right) = 0,$$

for all $x \in A$ and all $j \in I$. Therefore

$$\sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,j} \varphi_1(p - x) = 0,$$

for all $x \in A$ and all $j \in I$. Since $\varphi_1(p-x) = 1 - \delta_{p,x}$, and the system of linear equations

$$\sum_{p=0}^{k-1} (1 - \delta_{p,x}) t_p = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in A$$

over A has only the trivial solution $t_p = 0$ for all $p \in A$, we get that

$$\sum_{q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,j} = 0 \in A,$$

for all $p \in A$ and all $j \in I$. Hence $\deg(g_l) = \sum_{p,q=0}^{k-1} z_{p,q,l} = k z_l$ for some integer z_l. Thus $(0,0,i_l)^{-k z_l} g_l \in H$, for all l. Hence

$$g = g_1 \cdots g_n \in \mathrm{gr}((a,b,i)^k \mid a, b \in A,\ i \in I) H$$

and this proves the claim (3). Now it is clear that $\sigma_{(0,0,i_1)} \notin \phi(H)$. Hence $\phi(H)$ is a proper ideal of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I), r)$. Since

$$\sigma^{-1}_{(1,0,i_1)} \sigma_{(0,0,i_1)}(0,0,i_1) = \sigma^{-1}_{(1,0,i_1)}(0,0,i_1) = (0,1,i_1) \neq (0,0,i_1)$$

and $\mathrm{id} \neq \sigma^{-1}_{(1,0,i_1)} \sigma_{(0,0,i_1)} \in \phi(H)$, the result follows. ∎

Consider now the structure group $G(X(A,B,I), r)$ of the solution $(X(A,B,I), r)$ of Theorem 3.3. Suppose that A, B and I are finite. Hence $X(A,B,I)$ is finite and by [26, Corollary 8.2.7], $G(X(A,B,I), r)$ is solvable and a Bieberbach group, i.e. a finitely generated torsion-free abelian-by-finite group, see [13]. It would be interesting to characterize when the structure group of a solution is poly-(infinite cyclic). Recall that a multipermutation solution of the YBE on a finite set X has a structure group that is poly-(infinite cyclic), see [26, Proposition 8.2.12]. It remains an open question whether the converse holds. Farkas in

[17, Theorem 23] showed that a Bieberbach group is poly-(infinite cyclic) if and only if every non-trivial subgroup has a non-trivial center. This is one of the key ingredients of the proof of the following result. Another key ingredient is based on the application of the natural structure of a left brace on the structure group of a solution of the YBE, explained in Section 2.

Theorem 4.4 *If A, B and I are finite, $\varphi_1(0) = 0$, $\varphi_1(A)$ generates B and φ_2 is an isomorphism, then $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ is not a poly-(infinite cyclic) group.*

Proof. Let G_i be the subgroup of $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ generated by $\{(a,b,i) \mid a \in A,\ b \in B\}$. By Theorem 3($iv$), the sets $\{(a,b,i) \mid a \in A,\ b \in B\}$ are the orbits of $X(A,B,I)$ under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$. Let $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\}$ with $|I| = n$. Thus, by Lemma 2.3, every element g of $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ can be written uniquely as $g = g_1 + \cdots + g_n$, for some $g_l \in G_{i_l}$. Let $H = \{g_1 + \cdots + g_n \mid g_l \in G_{i_l}$ and $\deg(g_l) = 0\}$. By Lemma 2.5, H is an ideal of $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ and it is easy to see that $G(X(A,B,I),r)/H \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$.

To prove that $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ is not poly-(infinite cyclic), it is sufficient to show that $Z(H) = \{1\}$ (see [17, Theorem 23]).

We will show now that indeed $Z(H) = \{1\}$. Suppose $h \in Z(H)$. Then λ_h has finite order, since $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$ is a finite group. Let s be the order of λ_h. So $h^s \in Z(H)$ and $\lambda_{h^s} = \mathrm{id}$. The group $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ is torsion-free, therefore, replacing h by h^s, we may assume that $\lambda_h = \mathrm{id}$. Let $g \in H$. Then

$$\lambda_g(h) = gh - g = hg - g = \lambda_h(g) + h - g = g + h - g = h.$$

Let $h_l \in G_{i_l}$ be such that $h = h_1 + \cdots + h_n$. Then $\lambda_g(h) = \lambda_g(h_1) + \cdots + \lambda_g(h_n)$. By Lemma 2.3, G_i is invariant under the action of $\mathcal{G}(X(A,B,I),r)$. Hence $\lambda_g(h_l) \in G_{i_l}$ for all l. Since $h = \lambda_g(h)$, comparing their decompositions as sums of element of the subgroups G_{i_l}, we have, by Lemma 2.3, that $\lambda_g(h_1) = h_1$. We know that the additive group of $G(X(A,B,I),r)$ is free abelian with basis $X(A,B,I)$. Thus, we may assume that

$$h_1 = n_1(a_1,b_1,i_1) + \cdots + n_m(a_m,b_m,i_1), \tag{4}$$

where $(a_1,b_1,i_1), \ldots, (a_m,b_m,i_1)$ are m distinct elements of $X(A,B,I)$ and $\sum_{l=1}^{m} n_l = 0$. By the hypothesis, $\varphi_1(A)$ generates B, so for every l there exist $c_1, \ldots, c_s \in A$ and $z_1, \ldots z_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $b_l - b_1 = z_1\varphi_1(c_1) + \cdots + z_s\varphi_1(c_s)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} f &= (a_l,b_l,i_1)^{-z_1-\ldots-z_s}(a_l+c_1,0,i_1)^{z_1}\cdots(a_l+c_s,0,i_1)^{z_s} \\ &\quad \cdot(0,0,i_2)^{-1}(0,\varphi_2^{-1}(a_l-a_1),i_2). \end{aligned}$$

We have that $f \in H$. Hence, by the above, $\lambda_f(h_1) = h_1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_f((a_1,b_1,i_1)) \\ &= \sigma_{(a_l,b_l,i_1)}^{-z_1-\ldots-z_s}\sigma_{(a_l+c_1,0,i_1)}^{z_1}\cdots\sigma_{(a_l+c_s,0,i_1)}^{z_s}\sigma_{(0,0,i_2)}^{-1}\sigma_{(0,\varphi_2^{-1}(a_l-a_1),i_2)}((a_1,b_1,i_1)) \\ &= \sigma_{(a_l,b_l,i_1)}^{-z_1-\ldots-z_s}\sigma_{(a_l+c_1,0,i_1)}^{z_1}\cdots\sigma_{(a_l+c_s,0,i_1)}^{z_s}((a_l,b_1,i_1)) \\ &= \sigma_{(a_l,b_l,i_1)}^{-z_1-\ldots-z_s}((a_l,b_l,i_1)) \\ &= (a_l,b_l,i_1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, from (4) we get that $n_1 = n_l$, for all $l = 1, \ldots, m$. Since $\sum_{l=1}^{m} n_l = 0$, it follows that $n_l = 0$ for all l, and thus $h_1 = 1$. Similarly one can prove that $h_2 = \cdots = h_n = 1$, and therefore $h = 1$, as desired. ∎

The assertion of Theorem 4.4 also seems to be of interest from the point of view of the Kaplansky conjecture on non-existence of nontrivial units in group algebras of torsion-free groups. The structure groups $G(X(A, B, I), r)$ provide some natural nontrivial examples for testing this conjecture.

Acknowledgments

The two first-named authors were partially supported by the grants DGI MICIIN MTM2011-28992-C02-01, and MINECO MTM2014-53644-P. The third author is supported in part by Onderzoeksraad of Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (Belgium). The fourth author is supported by the National Science Centre grant 2013/09/B/ST1/04408 (Poland).

References

[1] D. Bachiller, Classification of braces of order p^3, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 219 (2015), 3568–3603.

[2] D. Bachiller, Counterexample to a conjecture about braces, J. Algebra 453 (2016), 160–176.

[3] D. Bachiller, Examples of simple left braces, arXiv:1511.08477v1[math.GR].

[4] D. Bachiller, F. Cedó and E. Jespers, Solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation associated with a left brace, J. Algebra 460 (2016), 80–102.

[5] G. Baumslag, Wreath products and p-groups, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 55 (1959), 224–231.

[6] N. Ben David, On groups of central type and involutive Yang-Baxter groups: a cohomological approach, Ph.D. thesis, The Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, 2012.

[7] N. Ben David and Y. Ginosar, On groups of central type, non-degenerate and bijective cohomology classes, Israel J. Math. 172 (2009), 317–335.

[8] N. Ben David and Y. Ginosar, On groups of I-type and involutive Yang-Baxter groups, J. Algebra 458 (2016), 197–206.

[9] F. Catino and R. Rizzo, Regular subgroups of the affine group and radical circle algebras, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 79 (2009), no. 1, 103–107.

[10] F. Cedó, E. Jespers and J. Okniński, Retractability of the set theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, Adv. Math. 224 (2010), 2472–2484.

[11] F. Cedó, E. Jespers and J. Okniński, Braces and the Yang-Baxter equation, Commun. Math. Phys. 327 (2014), 101–116.

[12] F. Cedó, E. Jespers and Á. del Río, Involutive Yang-Baxter groups, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 362 (2010), 2541–2558.

[13] L.S. Charlap, Bieberbach Groups and Flat Manifolds, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

[14] V. G. Drinfeld, On unsolved problems in quantum group theory. Quantum Groups, Lecture Notes Math. 1510, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992, 1–8.

[15] P. Etingof and S. Gelaki, A method of construction of finite-dimensional triangular semisimple Hopf algebras, Mathematical Research Letters 5 (1998), 551–561.

[16] P. Etingof, T. Schedler, A. Soloviev, Set-theoretical solutions to the quantum Yang-Baxter equation, Duke Math. J. 100 (1999), 169–209.

[17] D. R. Farkas, Crystallographic groups and their mathematics, Rocky Mountain J. Math. 11 (1981), 511–551.

[18] S.C. Featherstonhaugh, A. Caranti and L.N. Childs, Abelian Hopf Galois structures on prime-power Galois field extensions, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 364 (2012), 3675–3684.

[19] T. Gateva-Ivanova, A combinatorial approach to the set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, J. Math. Phys. 45 (2004), 3828–3858.

[20] T. Gateva-Ivanova, Set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, braces, and symmetric groups, arXiv:1507.02602v2[math.QA].

[21] T. Gateva-Ivanova and P. Cameron, Multipermutation solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, Comm. Math. Phys. 309 (2012), 583–621.

[22] T. Gateva-Ivanova and S. Majid, Matched pairs approach to set theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, J. Algebra 319 (2008), no. 4, 1462–1529.

[23] T. Gateva-Ivanova and M. Van den Bergh, Semigroups of I-type, J. Algebra 206 (1998), 97–112.

[24] P. Hegedüs, Regular subgroups of the affine group, J. Algebra 225 (2000), 740–742.

[25] E. Jespers and J. Okniński, Monoids and groups of I-type, Algebr. Represent. Theory 8 (2005), 709–729.

[26] E. Jespers and J. Okniński, Noetherian Semigroup Algebras, Springer, Dordrecht 2007.

[27] H. Liebeck, Concerning nilpotent wreath products, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 58 (1962), 443–451.

[28] W. Rump, A decomposition theorem for square-free unitary solutions of the quantum Yang-Baxter equation, Adv. Math. 193 (2005), 40–55.

[29] W. Rump, Modules over braces, Algebra Discrete Math. (2006) no. 2, 127–137.

[30] W. Rump, Braces, radical rings, and the quantum Yang-Baxter equation, J. Algebra 307 (2007), 153–170.

[31] W. Rump, Classification of cyclic braces, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 209 (2007), 671–685.

[32] W. Rump, Generalized radical rings, unknotted biquandles, and quantum groups, Colloq. Math. 109 (2007), 85–100.

[33] W. Rump, Semidirect products in algebraic logic and solutions of the quantum Yang-Baxter equation, J. Algebra Appl. 7 (2008), 471–490.

[34] W. Rump, Addendum to "Generalized radical rings, unknotted biquandles, and quantum groups" (Colloq. Math. 109 (2007), 85–100), Colloq. Math. 117 (2009), 295–298.

[35] W. Rump, The brace of a classical group, Note Math. 34 (2014), 115–144.

[36] Y. P. Sysak, Product of group and the quantum Yang-Baxter equation, notes of a talk in Advances in Group Theory and Applications, 2011, Porto Cesareo.

[37] M. Takeuchi, Survey on matched pairs of groups. An elementary approach to the ESS-LYZ theory, Banach Center Publ. 61 (2003), 305–331.

[38] L. Vendramin, Extensions of set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation and a conjecture of Gateva-Ivanova, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 220 (2016), no. 5, 2064–2076.

[39] C.N. Yang, Some exact results for the many-body problem in one dimension with repulsive delta-function interaction, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19 (1967), 1312–1315.

D. Bachiller
Departament de Matemàtiques
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain
dbachiller@mat.uab.cat

F. Cedó
Departament de Matemàtiques
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain
cedo@mat.uab.cat

E. Jespers
Department of Mathematics
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium
efjesper@vub.ac.be

J. Okniński
Institute of Mathematics
Warsaw University
Banacha 2, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland
okninski@mimuw.edu.pl